

## PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP AND PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES OF STUDENTS VIS-À-VIS ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

John Wayne V. Jacinto<sup>1</sup> and Evelyn R. Campiseño<sup>2</sup>

Date Submitted: October 2013

Date Revised: January 2014

Word Count: 8,553

### Abstract

*This study aimed to find out the parent-child relationship and personal attributes in relation to the academic performance of college freshmen students in Jose Rizal Memorial State University System for the second semester of SY 2012-2013. The descriptive-correlational method of research was used in the study with the aid of standardized questionnaires on parent-child relationship and self-concept. There were 358 respondents involved in the study. The study revealed that the respondents have moderate parent-child relationship on the dimensions like protecting, demanding, symbolic reward, and loving. On the other hand, they have high parent-child relationship on symbolic punishment, rejection, object punishment, indifference, object reward and neglecting. The respondents have above average level of personal attributes. The respondents generally have a good academic performance. With regard to the relationship between parent-child relationship and academic performance, it is only significant on the following dimensions: symbolic punishment, object punishment, demanding, symbolic reward, loving, object reward, and neglecting. On the relationship between personal attributes and academic performance, it is only significant on temperamental and intellectual dimensions as well as on the combined personal attributes. The study does not imply that positive or negative perceptions towards parent-child relationship and a clear or confusing personal attributes strongly entail a good academic performance.*

**Keywords:** Parent-child relationship, personal attributes, students' academic performance

### Introduction

The relationship between parents and children has undergone significant transformation in today's society. The traditional parent-child relationship, in which parents themselves spent more time developing close bonds with their children by providing for their needs in a loving and caring manner, is increasingly waning. As a result, parents struggle to foster in their children excellent character traits and keep a loving and caring relationship with them. The degree of academic success of the students would depend on the type of parent-child interaction that formed in the home. In a similar vein, a student's academic performance is influenced by how they see their own personal qualities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Instructor, Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Dapitan Campus

<sup>2</sup> Vice President for Research, Extension and Development, Jose Rizal Memorial State University System



According to Barnard and Kelly, who were quoted by Kamble (2009), a child's capacity to relate to, choose, and regulate his own behavior through choices is influenced by his relationship and contact with his parents in a variety of subtly unconscious ways. Parent-child interaction has long been considered a crucial influence on a child's academic performance and development. Children's success has been linked to a friendly family environment, less parental control, and sympathetic parental encouragement (Taylor, Clayton and Rowley, 2004). Parental relationship which refers to the bond that parents form for their child has a significant role in their child's academic performance in school. Dr. Nalini Rao as cited by Kamble (2009) classified parental relationships into demanding, indifference, loving, neglecting, protecting, rejecting, symbolic reward and object reward, and symbolic punishment and object punishment.

Personal attributes as a factor that accounts for future academic success is classified into six dimensions, namely physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral, and intellectual. In this study personal attributes pertain to person's self-conception. It covers the person's values, convictions, and beliefs. It also includes attitudes of himself or herself as a person, his/her worth, his or her right to have his/ her own feelings and thoughts and making his /her own decisions (Sood 2006). The development and conception of personal attributes are better ways of looking at yourself and making ameliorations to the sides where you think you are weak. Thus, how a student views himself/herself could determine his/her academic achievement. If the students view and believe themselves as less competent compared to other students, then most likely they would tend to have a lower academic performance by limiting to what they can actually accomplish. This is in contrast to students with a better view of themselves who would excel academically by maximizing their potential and overcoming their weaknesses.

In the Philippines, a number of schools with poor academic performance have been subjects of many studies and recommendations on how to improve such problem. New teaching approaches, strategies, and techniques have been employed to improve students' academic performance. The schools' performance is also a replica to the academic performance of their students. Jose Rizal Memorial State University (JRMSU) is also an institution in Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines which aims to achieve and maintain excellent academic performance among its students. Thus, the researchers of this study want to test whether parental relationship and personal attributes are also determining factors in the academic performance of students in JRMSU.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The study is anchored on the Attachment theory of Bowlby which states that "early attachment relationship is an instinctual process with a primary goal of maintaining proximity to the caregiver" (Parker, 2000; Conrad, 2000). An attachment relationship is created by dynamic interaction with the caregiver, which is mediated by behavioral systems and feedback.

For the early parent-child attachment bond to function as both a safe haven during stressful times and a safe base from which the child can explore the surroundings, the

caregiver must be close by. Insofar as the caregiver is accessible and attentive to the child's needs, security is felt and inquiry is encouraged. On the basis of this proximal relationship, the child forms a cognitive schema that serves as a prototype for future relationships and exploration (Bowlby as cited by Parker, 2000).

The second variable of the study, personal attributes is anchored on the Self-concept Theory of Super as cited in Allison and Cossettee (2007). For Super self-concept is an idea of oneself in a particular situation, role, or position, carrying out a particular set of tasks, or participating in a certain network of interactions. Social, experiential, interactive learning combined with introspective self-awareness helps shape one's self-concept. An ordered self-concept can then be used to regulate, direct, and assess behavior. An individual possesses a general self-concept that includes a number of more specific and limited self-concepts expressed in various roles. The self-concept system consists of all of the individual's roles.

## Methods

The descriptive-correlational method of research was used in the study with the aid of standardized questionnaires on parent-child relationship and personal attributes. The questionnaire on parent-child relationship was adopted from Rao as cited in Kamble (2009). It was divided into ten dimensions, namely: protecting, symbolic punishment, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, indifference, symbolic reward, loving, object reward, and neglecting. In order to measure the personal attributes, the questionnaire developed by Saraswat on self-concept as cited in Kamble (2009) was used and it consisted of 48 statements, classified into six dimensions namely, physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral and intellectual.

The respondents of the study were the college freshmen students of the campuses of JRMSU namely, Dapitan Campus, Dipolog Campus, Katipunan Campus, Tampilisan Campus, and Siocon Campus.

The simple proportionate stratified sampling with the lottery method was used to represent the respondents in each campus proportionately. The total number of college freshmen students in the JRMSU during the second semester SY 2012-2013 was 3397. Using the slovin's formula at 5% margin of error, the sample size of respondents was 358.

Mean, percentage, and frequency count were used to determine the level of parent-child relationship and personal attributes. On the other hand, pearson r product moment correlation and t-test were used in finding out the significant relationship of parent-child relationship and personal attributes to the academic performance of students.

## Results and Discussions

Table 1 shows the level of parent-child relationship dimensions. Most of the respondents viewed both their parents as moderate in terms of protecting behavior. This finding is supported by Kamble (2009) where she also found out that more than one half



of the respondents expressed that both their mothers' and fathers' protecting behavior were moderate.

Being protective parents is already part of the Philippine culture. In the East-West Center Working Paper authored by Cruz, G, et al. (2011), most of the adolescents who spend their years in an intact family structure received more adequate guidance and attention to protect them from engaging in risk behaviors. Likewise, the effect of protective parental values is evident in the levels of mothers' and fathers' strictness and the lesser likelihood to engage in negative social activities.

The table shows that in terms of the second dimension, both parents were perceived by most of the respondents as high in giving symbolic punishment. These data contradict the findings of Kamble (2009) who found out that half of the respondents expressed less symbolic punishment towards their mothers and almost half perceived their fathers as moderate in symbolic punishment. In terms of object punishment being practiced by parents, results showed high symbolic and object punishments to their children. Symbolic punishment is associated with complaints, verbal annoyance, scolds, unwanted behaviors, embarrassments while object punishment constitute those punishments which involve removal of desired things, physical inflictions, taking away of privileges (such as playing or having a good time), additional workloads, etc.

**Table 1 Level of Parent-Child Relationship Dimensions**

| Parent-Child Relationship Dimensions |                     | Mother          |                 |                 | Father          |                 |                 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                      |                     | Low             | Moderate        | High            | Low             | Moderate        | High            |
| 1                                    | Protecting          | 40<br>(11.17%)  | 267<br>(74.58%) | 51<br>(14.25%)  | 27 (7.54%)      | 242<br>(67.60%) | 89<br>(24.86%)  |
| 2                                    | Symbolic Punishment | 6<br>(1.68%)    | 90<br>(25.14%)  | 262<br>(73.18%) | 5<br>(1.40%)    | 105<br>(29.33%) | 248<br>(69.27%) |
| 3                                    | Rejection           | 13<br>(3.63%)   | 67<br>(18.72%)  | 278<br>(77.65%) | 10<br>(2.79%)   | 47<br>(13.13%)  | 301<br>(84.08%) |
| 4                                    | Object Punishment   | 125<br>(34.92%) | 141<br>(39.39%) | 92<br>(25.70%)  | 34<br>(9.50%)   | 60<br>(16.76%)  | 264<br>(73.74%) |
| 5                                    | Demanding           | 36<br>(10.06%)  | 163<br>(45.53%) | 159<br>(44.41%) | 51<br>(14.25%)  | 248<br>(69.27%) | 59<br>(16.48%)  |
| 6                                    | Indifferent         | 12<br>(3.35%)   | 113<br>(31.56%) | 233<br>(65.08%) | 2<br>(0.60%)    | 20<br>(5.59%)   | 336<br>(93.85%) |
| 7                                    | Symbolic Reward     | 50<br>(13.97%)  | 231<br>(64.53%) | 77<br>(21.51%)  | 116<br>(32.40%) | 229<br>(63.97%) | 13<br>(3.63%)   |
| 8                                    | Loving              | 49<br>(13.69%)  | 238<br>(66.48%) | 71<br>(19.83%)  | 88<br>(24.58%)  | 220<br>(61.45%) | 50<br>(13.97%)  |
| 9                                    | Object Reward       | 18<br>(5.03%)   | 108<br>(30.17%) | 232<br>(64.80%) | 30<br>(8.38%)   | 129<br>(36.03%) | 199<br>(55.59%) |
| 10                                   | Neglecting          | 10<br>(2.79%)   | 43<br>(12.01%)  | 305<br>(85.20%) | 6<br>(1.68%)    | 45<br>(12.57%)  | 307<br>(85.75%) |

Punishment whether symbolic or object is already part of discipline practiced by Filipinos to guide their children on the right path by making them realize their mistakes to limit the possible repetitions of undesirable acts. The reason that the respondents' parents were not excluded from practicing punishments to their erring children. According to Barrios (2012), refusing to hold a child accountable when he does something wrong sends the message that he never makes a mistake. This teaches the child to blame others whenever

problems arise. Instead, it teaches the child the importance of taking responsibility for his own actions and then use firm boundaries to make sure he does so. Child experts agree that disciplining as early as possible is the best way to mold the child. Parents should be reminded though that “discipline is not about punishment. It's about teaching and guidance”.

In the third dimension of parent-child relationship, most of the respondents perceived both their parents as having high rejection behavior. Rejection is evident in renouncing the child in aversion. The attitude is demonstrated by the child being treated with contempt and outright rejection. Social and contextual processes are also at play. Socioeconomic variables like limited income, unemployment, large family size, unplanned parenthood, and single parenthood contribute to the expression of violent behavior. According to Bautista et al. (n.d.) as cited in Osteria (2011 [p.18]) "poverty...has emerged as a strong predictor of abuse...and parental singularity or isolation has been seen as a significant correlate." Frequently, financial difficulty enhances inconsistent, rejection-focused parental discipline. Heavy income loss, likewise, leads to punitive and arbitrary patterns of child rearing (Bautista et al. as cited in Osteria, 2011). The table indicates that in the fifth and sixth dimensions, majority of the respondents perceived a moderate demanding behavior and a high indifferent behavior from their fathers and mothers.

Dr. Rao as cited by Kamble (2009), defined demanding as an expression of authority and claim with imperious command over the child, executed in the exercise of overall control. According to North (2011), demanding parents often have reasons behind their behavior towards their kids. For most parents the continuity of the family ‘legacy’ is important. For example, if a certain student comes from a family of doctors, chances are, they are expected to become one, regardless of one’s capacity or inclination. When one or both parents are achievers, they do not see any reason that their children themselves could not manifest their talents. Some parents with average incomes push their children to perform above and beyond their capabilities in order to qualify for scholarship grants and cut the cost of education as much as possible. Many parents believe that giving their kids everything will ensure their success. Additionally, there is no reason why they cannot succeed because everything is provided. Other parents experience envy and even self-doubt when they hear parents brag about their children's accomplishments. Parents then increase the pressure on their child as a result of how they feel.

Demands from parents are already part of Filipino tradition. Graduates are also expected to share, if not take on themselves, the parental obligations. They should send their siblings to school in exchange. Some parents are very outspoken about their demands, forcing their working kids to raise the family's standard of living. Some people believe that the next step would be to upgrade their home, buy a new automobile, and new appliances. Unless the daughter or son marries and starts a family of his own, the list never seems to stop. Even after that, some parents and siblings still look forward to being taken care of (Sporadic Pieces, 2010). According to the majority of the respondents, both parents in the study exhibit demanding conduct, but it is done so in a way that authentically reflects Filipino culture.



The expectations and demands seem to be natural. It should always be the child's choice to help the family out after graduation. In other words, it is a voluntary act done wholeheartedly and not out of obligation. Parents who demand "help" from their kids rob them off the initiative, true gratitude and genuine appreciation.

On the demanding dimension, it shows only a moderate behavior among the respondents' parents, it means that it is an indicator of a moderate indifference or involvement towards their children. Indifference is an expression of unconcerned, apathetic, passive behavior and functioning without either importance or interest in the child. Parents who are permissive indifferent tend to display low levels of demandingness. They ask very little from their children. Due to their lack of emotional connection and child supervision, these parents are generally uninvolved in the lives of their kids and exhibit low levels of responsiveness. The parents are generally not involved in their child's life, they provide basic needs for the child. It doesn't imply that parents don't care about their children. They simply think children should have as little parental influence as possible and live their own lives. Additionally, these parents typically don't communicate well with their children. This is due to the fact that children are typically given the freedom to "do their own thing" with little adult supervision. In its most extreme form, this parenting approach could be perceived as neglect by outsiders. These parents put their children first (Baumrind et al. [2010]; Costanzo [2014]; Ishak et al. [2009]).

In terms of the symbolic dimension, mothers are considered to give more symbolic rewards as compared to the fathers as evidenced in the figures. Many of these symbolic rewards instill a sense of pride in the child, such as a sticker that says the child is a good person or the smartest in the class. Some symbolic rewards can be exchanged for a service in the home. For example, for consistent good behavior or grades, a parent can reward the child. Certain goods and services will cost money only within the household. So, if the child wants to stay up an extra 30 minutes on Friday night, they need about 30 family money to purchase such time. The data further show that in this dimension, mothers and fathers were seen to have moderate loving behavior. This means that both parents are attached to the children which would develop more love based on their roles played in the family.

Parenting that is neither authoritarian nor permissive is not loving parenting. Parenting that is loving values the needs and feelings of both the parents and the children. Except in cases of health and safety, loving parents never try to manage their children and never give them the power to do so. They don't hit, yell at, or otherwise abuse their children, and they don't let their children abuse them either. They don't expect their children to sacrifice themselves for others, and they don't sacrifice themselves for their children either (Paul, M. 2012).

On the same table, both parents were similarly rated to have both high object reward and neglecting behavior. Rao, N. as cited by Kamble (2009) characterized neglecting as a careless slighting treatment indicated in accustomed omission and deliberate disregard towards the child which might leave the child to devalue himself.



The causes of being neglectful as a parent can be traced from parents' own developmental history and resultant personal psychological resources, characteristics of the family and child, and contextual sources of stress and support (Gaudin 1993). A parents' capacity to care for a child effectively depends in part on their emotional development, coping mechanisms, parenting abilities, and understanding of children. The inability of the parents to provide their children with the consistent nurturing required for the development of secure psychological attachments is not so much due to the inadequate or abusive nurturing they received as children as it is due to the unacknowledged deprivations and unresolved feelings surrounding these early experiences.

In fact, there is evidence that the transmission of neglect from one generation to the next involves significant mediating influences. Less stressful life events occur for neglect victims who break the cycle. According to Polansky et al. as stated by Gaudin (1993) highlighted that inattentive parents frequently exhibit widespread inadequacies in coping mechanisms across a wide range of life domains. Mothers who are neglectful are also significantly less adept in social interaction, communication, and problem-solving. Neglectful parents have also been found to lack awareness of and empathy for children's age-appropriate requirements. Neglectful mothers are sometimes described as verbally unavailable. Compared to non-neglecting parents, they have more unreasonable and unfavorable expectations of their children.

As a whole, parent-child relationship has to do with how parents were raised. By default, parents raise their kids the way they were raised; or, quite often, they raise our kids in reaction to how they were raised. Many struggles with being inconsistent is one of the most difficult battles of parenting.

Table 2 shows the respondents' level of personal attributes on the physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral, and intellectual dimensions as well as their overall self-concept. This is presented as part of the factor that could influence the respondents' academic performance.

In all the six dimensions of personal attributes – physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral, and intellectual - majority of the respondents perceived an above average level of personal attributes among all these dimensions. This implies that the respondents have knowledge of themselves with regard to the dimensions but on above average level. The result of the study is corroborated by Kamble (2009) where she also found out that in terms of the overall self concept which is pointed to the personal attributes, majority (52.80%) of her respondents are above average.

Self concept according to Uma Devi et al as cited by Kamble (2009) is not a substance but a process in which a conversation between the “I” and “ME” takes place. The “ME” is the more or less integrated set of attitudes and ideas of other people which have been built together as their conscious experience and from which they also choose roles to represent their own ideas of themselves. In terms of physical dimension, the respondents have above average knowledge or are really aware of their body, health, physical appearance and strength. Most of them have also the same level of knowledge with regard to social dimension which involves individuals' sense of worth in social interactions; temperamental



dimension which pertains to individuals' view of their prevailing emotional state or predominance of a particular kind of emotional action; educational dimension which denotes individuals' view of themselves in relation to school, teachers and extracurricular activities; moral dimension which describes individuals' estimation of their moral worth, right and wrong activities; intellectual dimension which depicts individuals' awareness of their intelligence and capacity of problem solving and judgments. JRMSU system students have shown that they are already matured individuals although they were in the first year level. They have clear knowledge of themselves as to the six dimensions of personal attributes. A good environment which promotes positive personal attributes can also be seen in the JRMSU System environment. In other words, the learning environment in the system in general promotes individual awareness not for discouragement of their individual self after knowing that they have lower level of personal attributes perceived but rather encouraging them to level-up their self-perceptions.

This claim is affirmed by Grotevant & Cooper as cited by Wright, A. (2011). As the lives of adolescents are arguably primarily embedded in the home and educational environments, it seems reasonable that school will be of significant psychological importance and salience in shaping personal attributes. Furthermore, progression through adolescence signifies a transitional period when individuals are proposed to experience greater separation from parents leading to school social context gaining greater psychological significance.

Trautwein U, Lüdtke O, Köller O, Baumert J.(2006) also put special emphasis on learning environments as potential moderators of the direction of these effects. The meritocracy principle put forth here states that meritocratic learning contexts outperform ego-protective learning environments in terms of the so-called bottom-up effects (i.e., self-esteem is influenced by academic self-concept).

The big-fish-little-pond effect states that "learners compare their own academic competence with that of their classmates and then use this social comparison perception as one basis for the creation of their academic self-concept" (Byrne as cited in McGrew, 2008). When students contrast their own academic performance or abilities with those of their peers, the big-fish-little-pond effect takes place (an external frame of reference). For instance, "a negative big-fish-little-pond effect is shown when learners of equal ability exhibit worse academic self-concepts after comparing themselves with more able learners, albeit they demonstrate stronger academic self-concepts following comparison with less able learners.



**Table 2      Distribution of Students' Level of Personal Attributes in Terms of the Six Dimensions**

| Dimension of Personal Attributes | High      | Above Average | Average   | Below Average |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| Physical                         | 21(5.87)  | 286(79.89)    | 51(14.25) |               |
| Social                           | 55(15.36) | 270(75.42)    | 24(6.70)  | 9(2.51)       |
| Temperamental                    | 21(5.87)  | 292(81.56)    | 44(12.29) | 1(0.28)       |
| Educational                      | 41(11.45) | 281(78.49)    | 36(10.06) |               |
| Moral                            | 75(20.95) | 237(66.20)    | 35(9.78)  | 11(3.07)      |
| Intellectual                     | 19(5.31)  | 259(72.35)    | 79(22.07) | 1(0.28)       |
| Overall Self-concept             | 8(2.23)   | 329(91.90)    | 20(5.59)  | 1(0.28)       |

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table 3 shows the academic performance of students in JRSMU system. As can be gleaned from the table, most of the respondents (315 or 87.99%) belonged to the GPA range of 1.6-2.5 with a mean of 1.93 and a verbal description of good. The least group of respondents (3 or 0.84%) belonged in the range of GPA of 2.6-3.0 with a mean of 2.09 and a verbal description of fair. In the overall academic performance of the respondents, it obtained a mean of 2.09 with a verbal description of good.

The data imply that the students of JRMSU system have a good academic performance. And academic performance could be attributed to the quality of education offered in the University. The quality of education can also be linked to the qualification of instructors and professors in the University as well as to its instructional facilities and equipment provided.

**Table 3      Academic Performance of Students in JRMSU System**

| Range of GPA | Frequency  | Percentage | Mean        | Grade Point Average Description |
|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.1-1.5      | 40         | 11.17      | 1.46        | very good                       |
| 1.6-2.5      | 315        | 87.99      | 1.93        | good                            |
| 2.6-3.0      | 3          | 0.84       | 2.87        | fair                            |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>358</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>2.09</b> | <b>Good</b>                     |

**Table 4      Test of Relationship Between Parent-child Relationship and the Academic Performance of Students in JRMSU System**

| Variables                    | Mean   | r-computed | t-computed |
|------------------------------|--------|------------|------------|
| Protecting (Father)          | 33.821 | -0.024     | 0.45ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Protecting (Mother)          | 35.383 | -0.078     | 1.48ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Symbolic Punishment (Father) | 30.050 | -0.086     | 1.63ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Symbolic Punishment (Mother) | 31.020 | -0.171     | 3.27*      |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Rejection (Father)           | 27.735 | -0.040     | 0.76ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Rejection (Mother)           | 27.939 | -0.038     | 0.72ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Object Punishment (Father)   | 26.933 | -0.086     | 1.63ns     |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Object Punishment (Mother)   | 27.372 | -0.102     | 1.93*      |
| GPA                          | 1.89   |            |            |
| Demanding (Father)           | 30.983 | -0.062     | 1.17ns     |



| Variables                | Mean   | r-computed | t-computed |
|--------------------------|--------|------------|------------|
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Demanding (Mother)       | 32.128 | -0.147     | 2.80*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Indifferent (Father)     | 30.011 | 0.011      | 0.21ns     |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Indifferent (Mother)     | 31.028 | -0.011     | 0.21ns     |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Symbolic Reward (Father) | 32.704 | -0.098     | 1.85*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Symbolic Reward (Mother) | 34.101 | -0.125     | 2.38*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Loving (Father)          | 32.271 | -0.112     | 2.13*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Loving (Mother)          | 34.075 | -0.174     | 3.33*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Object Reward (Father)   | 29.550 | -0.083     | 1.57ns     |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Object Reward (Mother)   | 30.978 | -0.137     | 2.61*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Neglecting (Father)      | 28.545 | -0.087     | 1.64ns     |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |
| Neglecting (Mother)      | 28.994 | -0.089     | 1.69*      |
| GPA                      | 1.89   |            |            |

Legend:

|          |   |                 |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| d.f.     | = | 356             |
| c.v.(t)  | = | 1.65            |
| $\alpha$ | = | 0.05            |
| *        | = | significant     |
| ns       | = | not significant |

Table 4 shows the test of relationship between parent-child relationship and the academic performance of students in JRMSU System. With respect to the protecting dimension of fathers' parent-child relationship and students' grade point average, a computed r-value of -0.024 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When the r result was subjected to t-test, a computed t-value of 0.45 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65 at 0.05 level of significance with 356 degrees of freedom. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This implies that there is no significant relationship between fathers' protecting behavior and students' academic performance.

With regard to mothers in the same dimension and students' grade point average, a computed r-value of -0.078 was obtained and interpreted as negative correlation. When the value of r was subjected to t-test, a computed t-value of 1.48 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65 at 0.05 level of significance with 356 degrees of freedom. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This denotes that there is no significant relationship between mothers' protecting behavior and students' academic performance.

In terms of the symbolic punishment dimension among fathers and grade point average of students, a computed r-value of -0.086 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When this r-value was subjected to t-test, it obtained a computed t-value of

1.63 which was lower than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. It means that there is no significant relationship between fathers' symbolic punishment and students' academic performance. With respect to mothers on the same dimension and grade point average, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.171 was obtained and is interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 3.27 was higher than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant difference. This implies that there is a significant relationship between mothers' symbolic punishment and students' academic performance. Although the computed  $r$ -value was interpreted as negligible correlation, but at least there was a minimal if not visible relationship between the mentioned variables. It can also be seen that the value of  $r$  is negative, it suggests that as the mothers' symbolic punishment level is heightened the academic performance of students lowers at least in minimal value if not visible.

On the rejection dimension with respect to fathers and students' grade point average (GPA), a computed  $r$ -value of -0.040 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated to  $t$ -test, it yielded a computed  $t$ -value of 0.76 which was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This clearly indicates that there is no significant relationship between fathers rejection behavior and students' academic performance. On the part of mothers' rejection behavior and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.038 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated using  $t$ -test, it yielded a computed  $t$ -value of 0.72 which was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This implies that there is no significant relationship between mothers' rejection behavior and students' academic performance.

Between fathers' object punishment and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.086 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation with a  $t$ -value of 1.63 which was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. The data imply that there is no significant relationship between fathers' object punishment and students' academic performance. Mothers on the same dimension and students' GPA, yielded a computed  $r$ -value of -0.102 and interpreted as negligible correlation and a  $t$ -value of 1.93 which was greater than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. It means that there is a significant relationship between mothers' object punishment and students' academic performance. Although the computed  $r$ -value was interpreted as negligible correlation, but at least there was a minimal if not visible relationship between the mentioned variables. It can also be seen that the value of  $r$  is negative, it suggests that as the mothers' object punishment level is heightened the academic performance of students lowers at least in minimal value if not visible or vice versa.

On the demanding dimension of fathers and students GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.062 was interpreted as negligible correlation. When the  $r$ -value was treated with  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 1.17 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. The data reflect that there is no significant relationship between fathers' demanding behavior and students' academic performance. With respect to mothers, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.147 was interpreted as negligible correlation and a computed  $t$ -value of 2.80 was greater than the critical value of



1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This proves that there is a relationship between mothers' demanding behavior and students' academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it signifies that as the demanding behavior of mothers becomes higher the students' academic performance is otherwise at least in a minimal value if not visible.

Demanding parents have detrimental effects on their kids. The parental control is likely to concur with the notion that exerting too much parental control can impede a child's development. Children appear to interpret this as meddling in their lives and a loss of control. When kids are entering adolescence and seek more freedom from parental authority, this is especially important (El Nokali, 2010; Horace Scotswomen, 2012).

As reflected in the table the dimension on indifference among fathers and students' GPA, obtained a computed  $r$ -value of 0.011 and was interpreted as negligible correlation with a  $t$ -value of 0.21 which was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. It means that there is no significant relationship between the indifferent dimension among fathers and students' academic performance. The mothers on the same dimension and students' GPA, yielded a computed  $r$ -value of -0.011 which was interpreted as negligible correlation. When  $r$ -value was treated with  $t$ -test, it obtained a computed  $t$ -value of 0.21 lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This provides an evidence to accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between mothers' indifferent behavior and students' academic performance.

Between fathers' symbolic reward and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.098 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 1.85 was greater than the critical value of 1.65. This proves to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between fathers' symbolic rewards and students' academic performance. As can be seen, the value of  $r$  is negative denoting that as the fathers' level of symbolic reward goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible. For the mothers on the same dimension and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.125 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated with  $t$ -test, it yielded a computed  $t$ -value of 2.38 which was greater than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between mothers' symbolic reward and students' academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it denotes that as the mothers' level of symbolic reward goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible.

Further, the loving dimension with respect to fathers and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.112 was yielded and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated with  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 2.13 was greater than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between fathers' loving behavior and students' academic performance. On the side of mothers with the same dimension and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.174 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation with a  $t$ -value of 3.33 greater than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between mothers' loving behavior and students' academic performance. Both

r-values show a negative negligible correlation. It means that as the level of loving behaviors of parents go higher, the lower the academic performance of students or vice versa at least in a minimum value if not visible.

The study of Bahrudin, R. and Zulkefly, N.S. (2009) on the “Relationships with Father and Mother, Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement amongst College Students” showed that the quality of parent-students relationship was positively and significantly related to self-esteem and academic achievement. Students of good quality relationship with their parents evaluated themselves positively compared to others. However, only those who had positive ties with their mothers as opposed to their fathers had successful academic performance. The results of the current study expand the understanding of how parental interactions affect teenagers' outcomes.

In short the study cited above reflects that being loving parents are related to their children's academic performance. But the study shows a negative correlation. The reason can be linked to the fact that there are instances that too much love of parents to children yield a negative outcome. For instance in the case of spoiled students, out of their parents' love for them they were immediately provided with whatever they need. Emotional hunger can manifest as excessive worry, overprotection, living through one's child, or a keen attention to appearances. Parents who behave in this manner exert a strong pull on their child that drains a child of his or her emotional resource. Parents may mistake their own strong needs and anxious attachments for true love. They fail to make a distinction between emotional hunger, which is a strong need caused by deprivation in their own childhood, and genuine feelings of tenderness, love, and concern for their child's well-being. Parents who are emotionally insatiable use their children to satisfy their own demands; loving parents strive to meet their children's needs (Firestone, L. 2012).

On the object reward dimension of fathers and students' GPA, a computed r-value of -0.083 was interpreted as negligible correlation. When the r-value was treated with t-test, a computed t-value of 1.57 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between fathers' object reward and students' academic performance. With respect to mothers, a computed r-value of -0.137 was interpreted as negligible correlation and a computed t-value of 2.61 was greater than the critical value of 1.65. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between mothers' object reward and students' academic performance. Since the value of r is negative, it signifies that as the object reward of mothers becomes higher the students' academic performance is otherwise at least in a minimal value if not visible.

Between fathers' neglecting behavior and students' GPA, a computed r-value of -0.087 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to t-test, a computed t-value of 1.64 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65. This proves to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between fathers' neglecting behavior and students' academic performance. Mothers on the neglecting dimension and students' GPA, a computed r-value of -0.089 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated with t-test, it yielded a computed t-value of 1.69 which was greater than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between mothers' rejection behavior and



students' academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it denotes that as the mothers' level of rejecting behavior goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible.

**Table 5** Test of Relationship Between the Personal Attributes and the Academic Performance of Students in JRMSU System

| Variables               | Mean   | r-computed | t-computed |
|-------------------------|--------|------------|------------|
| Physical Dimension      | 27.645 | -0.040     | 0.75ns     |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Social Dimension        | 29.003 | 0.035      | 0.66ns     |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Temperamental Dimension | 27.804 | -0.190     | 3.65*      |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Educational Dimension   | 28.589 | -0.059     | 1.12ns     |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Moral Dimension         | 29.006 | -0.053     | 1.00ns     |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Intellectual Dimension  | 27.131 | -0.115     | 2.18*      |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |
| Combined Self-concept   | 169.18 | -0.103     | 1.95*      |
| Grade Point Average     | 1.89   |            |            |

Table 5 shows the test of relationship between the personal attributes and the academic performance of students in JRMSU system. In terms of students' physical dimension on personal attributes and students' GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.040 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 0.75 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This implies that there is no significant relationship between students' physical dimension of personal attributes and their academic performance. With regards to the social dimension of personal attributes, a computed  $r$ -value of 0.035 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 0.66 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This implies that there is no significant relationship between students' social dimension of personal attributes and their academic performance.

On the temperamental dimension of personal attributes, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.190 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 3.65 was greater than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the rejection of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This implies that there is a significant relationship between students' temperamental dimension of personal attributes and their academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it denotes that as the students' level of temperamental dimension of personal attributes goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible. With regard to the students' educational dimension of personal attributes and their GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of -0.59 was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of 1.12 was lesser than the critical value of 1.65, leading to the acceptance of null hypothesis of no significant relationship. This implies that there is no significant relationship between students' educational dimension of personal attributes and their academic performance.



Between the moral dimension of students' personal attributes and their GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of  $-0.053$  was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was subjected to  $t$ -test, a computed  $t$ -value of  $1.00$  was lesser than the critical value of  $1.65$ . This proves to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the moral dimension of students' personal attributes and their academic performance. On the intellectual dimension of their personal attributes and GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of  $-0.115$  was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated with  $t$ -test, it yielded a computed  $t$ -value of  $2.18$  which was greater than the critical value of  $1.65$ , leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between intellectual dimension of students' personal attributes and their academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it denotes that as the level of intellectual dimension of students' personal attributes goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible. On their combined personal attributes and GPA, a computed  $r$ -value of  $-0.103$  was obtained and interpreted as negligible correlation. When it was treated with  $t$ -test, it yielded a computed  $t$ -value of  $1.95$  which was greater than the critical value of  $1.65$ , leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between students' combined personal attributes and their academic performance. Since the value of  $r$  is negative, it denotes that as the level of students' combined personal attributes goes higher, the students' academic performance lowers or vice versa at least in a minimal value if not visible.

Similar findings have been found in the study of Zahra, A. (2010) on the relationship between self-concept including the personal attributes and academic achievement of female bachelor degree students. It was found that weak though real relationship existed between the academic dimension and academic achievement. No relationship was however found between physical dimension and academic achievement as well between social dimension and academic achievement.

## Conclusion

The parent-child relationship among the students manifested higher level of the undesirable behaviors and practices specifically on symbolic punishment, rejection, indifference, and neglecting dimensions. Despite higher level of undesirable dimensions of parent-child relationship, the students have a good academic performance. It projects that higher level of undesirable dimensions in parent-child relationship does not result in a lower academic performance.

Parents normally protect and love their children, the behaviors common to Filipino parents' identity where they lovingly guided and admonished children from undesirable influence on the environment. However, parents are demanding. This is another distinct characteristic of Filipino parents apparent on their expectations exerted from their children which require gratification. They are also disciplinarians, a fact already part of Filipino ways. Fathers are characterized as strong figures having higher authorities compared to mothers in imposing discipline.



As regard to the personal attributes, students perceived an above average level of personal attributes along physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral and intellectual dimensions. Thus, they have a clearer view of their attributes. The level of parent-child relationship along protecting, rejection, indifference and loving dimensions have no bearing on the level of students' academic performance except on the symbolic reward dimension. Consistently, the level of fathers' parent-child relationship on the symbolic punishment, object punishment, demanding, object reward, and neglecting dimensions do not affect the students' level of academic performance.

The students' level of personal attributes along physical, social, educational and moral dimensions do not entail the level of academic performance except for temperamental, intellectual and overall personal attributes. Students' personal attributes does not convey a direct relationship to the academic performance.

In general, parent-child relationship and students' personal attributes are not strong determinants of academic performance. It denotes that students' parent-child relationship experienced is not directly linked to academic performance when they reach the tertiary level of education. Similarly, the personal attributes of students which have been also progressively built in their lives, whether it would result to a clearer or confusing view towards themselves, does not have a direct connection to their academic performance. It also points that there are a number of factors affecting the academic performance of students aside from their parent-child relationship and personal attributes.

## References

- Allison, C.J. & Cossette, M. (2007). *Three Theories of Career Development and Choice (Literature Review)*. <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/7897825/three-theories-of-career-development-and-choice-proven->
- Baharudin, R. & Zulkefly, N. S. (2009). Relationships with Father and Mother, Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement amongst College Students. *American Journal of Scientific Research*. 6.86-94
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R.E., Owens, E.B. (2010). Effects of preschool parents' Power: Assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 10(3), 157–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295190903290790>
- Conrad, K. A. (2000). Impact of insecure attachment on children's social skill development. *Graduate Research Papers*. 508. <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/508>
- Costanzo, P (2014). Domain specific parenting styles. *Journal of social and clinical psychology*. 3 (4)
- Cruz, G.T., Laguna, E.P. & Raymundo, C.M. (2001). Family Influences on the Lifestyle of Filipino Youth. *East-West Center Working Papers*. No. 108-8. 1-24.

- Firestone, L. (2012). *Helping Parents Distinguish Love from Emotional Hunger*. Pyschalive. Retrieved from <https://www.pyschalive.org/helping-parents-distinguish-love-from-emotional-hunger/>
- Gaudin JM (1993). *Child Neglect: A Guide for Intervention*. Westover Consultants, Inc., Washington, DC. [https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubpdfs/neglect\\_1993.pdf](https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubpdfs/neglect_1993.pdf)
- Horace scotswomen (11 Oct. 2012). *Effects Of Excessive Parental Guidance And Control – Ayushveda*. <https://horace-scotswomen.blogspot.com/2012/10/effects-of-excessive-parental-guidance.html>
- Ishak, Z., Low, S.F. & Lau, P.L. Parenting Style as a Moderator for Students' Academic Achievement. *J Sci Educ Technol* 21, 487–493 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-011-9340-1>
- Kamble, S. (2009). Influence of Parental Relationship and Self-concept on Academic Achievement of PUC Students. Published Master Thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- McGrew, K. (1 July 2008). *Beyond IQ: A Model of Academic Competence & Motivation (MACM)*. [http://www.iapsych.com/acmcewok/Implications\(9\).html](http://www.iapsych.com/acmcewok/Implications(9).html)
- El Nokali, N. E., Bachman, H. J., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2010). Parent involvement and children's academic and social development in elementary school. *Child development*, 81(3), 988–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01447.x>
- North, R. (2011). *Smart Parenting: Raising Happy and Responsible Children in the 21st Century*. Dawn Publishing
- Osteria, T. (2011). *Changing Family Structure and Shifting Gender Roles: Impact on Child Development*. Rosario-Braid, F., Tuazon, R.R., & Lopez, A.L. (eds.). *The Future of Filipino Children: Development Issues and Trends*. UNICEF. Asian Institute of Journalism and Communication. <https://paperzz.com/doc/440175/the-future-of-filipino-children---asian-institute-of-jour...>
- Parker, J. S. (2000). *Parent Structure and Support and Adolescent Problems: Delinquency, Substance Abuse, and Peer and Self-esteem Deficits*. Published Doctoral Dissertation. Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Paul, M. (14 February 2012). *Authoritarian Parenting, Permissive Parenting or Loving Parenting*. [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/authoritarian-parenting-p\\_b\\_1148185](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/authoritarian-parenting-p_b_1148185)
- Polansky NA, Gaudin JM Jr, Ammons PW, Davis KB. The psychological ecology of the neglectful mother. *Child Abuse Negl.* 1985;9(2):265-75. doi: 10.1016/0145-2134(85)90019-5. PMID: 4005667.



- Sood, P. (2006). Educational choices in relation to academic stress, achievement motivation and academic self concept. *Journal of Community Guidance Research*, 23 (2).141-152.
- Sporadic Pieces (2010 Sep 30). *Some Filipino parents expect ROI from educating kids*. <https://sporadicpieces.wordpress.com/2010/09/30/some-filipino-parents-expect-roi-from-educating-kids/>
- Taylor, L.C., Clayton, J.D. and Rowley, S. J., (2004) Academic socialization: understanding parental influences on children's school related development in the early years. *Rev. Gen. Psychol.*, 8:163-178.
- Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O., & Baumert J. (2006). Self-esteem, Academic Self-concept, and Achievement: How the Learning Environment Moderates the Dynamics of Self-concept. Published. Center for Educational Research, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany.
- Wright, A. (2011). *What Impact Does the Learning Environment Have on Self-Concept?* Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology, Newcastle University. <https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/jspui/bitstream/10443/1269/1/Wright%20Angela%2011.pdf>
- Zahra, A. T. (2010). Relationship Between Self-concept and Academic Achievement of Female Bachelor Degree Students. Published Doctoral Dissertation. University Institute of Education and Research, Pakistan.